

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-17, and 19-23 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 16, 22 and 23 are amended. Claims 1, 10 and 16 are amended to incorporate the features of claims 5, 13, and 18, respectively, and claims 5, 13, and 18 are canceled accordingly. Claim 22 and 23 are amended to correct for minor grammatical errors.

No new matter is being added. Entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nishita *et al.* (US Application Publication 2003/0159617) (“Nishita”).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 5. Nishita does not teach or suggest the shift in  $\lambda_{\max}$  when the ink composition with and without the additive is compared. Furthermore, nowhere in Nishita is an indication that the molar ratio of the additive and the heterocyclic dye component is 1/1 with a concentration of at most 1 mmol/l. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that currently presented claim 1 is not anticipated by Nishita and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4 and 6- 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4, 6-9.

Claims 1-12 and 14-23 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nishida *et al.* (JP 2003-041162) (“Nishida”).

As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 5. Nishida does not teach or suggest the shift in  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  when the ink composition with and without the additive is compared. Furthermore, Nishida fails to disclose any indication that the molar ratio of the additive and the heterocyclic dye component is 1/1 with a concentration of at most 1 mmol/l. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Nishida, and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 and 6- 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6- 9.

Claim 10 is amended to incorporate the features of claim 13. In the Office Action, it was the Examiner has stated that claim 13 would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 is dependent from claim 10. Therefore, the incorporation of the features of claim 13 into claim 10 addresses the objection to claim 13 and renders claim 10 patentable. Applicants therefore request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11-12 and 14-15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-12 and 14-15.

Claim 16 is amended to incorporate the features of claim 18. Furthermore, the definition of “n” is restricted to “2” (i.e., n=2). Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 61, line 10 of the present specification. The yellow dye of amended claim 16 is a dimer, which is different from the yellow dyes used in Nishida. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully

submit that claim 16 is in condition for allowance, and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 19-23 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 16. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 19-23.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

---

Sunhee Lee  
Registration No. 53,892

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 12, 2008